

LONG RANGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Questions and Answers

1. Is the intermodal transit facility study a part of the Long-Range Metropolitan Area Transportation Plan project? If so, are any prior transit facility site study products available for reviewing prior to the March 18 RFP deadline? If not, have any preliminary sites been identified? Is the Public Transportation master Plan portion of this project supposed to address the location, type and uses of the intermodal transit facility, or just coordinate with decisions that have already been made about it's location, form, capacity, land use amenities, etc.?

No. The Intermodal Facility is included in the UPWP for funding purposes only. It is not a part of the long range plan.

2. Has a public transit master plan been completed in the study area within the past five years? If so, could the LCVMPPO fax or email an executive summary to us prior to the March 18 RFP deadline?

No, a public transit master plan has not been prepared.

3. Do the budget figures presented in Sections 3.0 and 4.0 of the LCVMPPO Unified Planning Work Program include local staff salary/benefit costs, or are these budget figures the amounts available to consultants as part of the Long-Range Metropolitan Area Transportation Plan study?

All staff costs are covered in Section 1.0. No staff costs are allocated in Sections 3.0 or 4.0.

4. Will the Public Transportation Master Plan require surveys of the general public regarding potential use or perceptions of public transit?

You should assume so as no other survey has taken place.

5. Will the Public Transportation Master Plan require surveys of passengers on existing public or social service transportation services in the region?

You should assume so as no other survey has taken place.

6. Will a study steering committee be formed for the Long Range Transportation Plan and/or the Public Transportation Master Plan? If so, what will be its role, and how many times over the course of the studies will it be expected to meet? How many public meetings can be expected for both studies?

The RFP requires the consultant to prepare a public participation plan. The consultant needs to gauge the level of public participation based upon their experience wit similar projects. The plan may propose steering committees or citizens advisory groups and a meeting schedule as appropriate to meet the needs of this community. This would be coordinated between consultant and policy board, but we feel this community will want to be actively involved in the process. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IS CRUCIAL TO THE SUCCESS OF THE PROJECT.

7. Is there a GIS system in place, either with the MPO or the cities, on which to build? Or would GIS efforts be starting from scratch? GIS: What is the current status of GIS in the valley and what level of GIS mapping is anticipated with the work?

Lewiston and Nez Perce County both have GIS. Consultant is not to provide GIS but to provide data in a format that can be used in GIS.

8. In terms of data collection, how much does the MPO already have for freight movement and traffic counts and how much are you anticipating doing as part of this study?

All entities within the metropolitan area have traffic counts and other data to varying degrees. The consultant will need to review existing data and recommend the need for additional data and data format and collect the missing data. Most entities don't have specifics on freight movement.

9. Are there currently any air quality problems in the area?

The region is currently in compliance with air quality regulations. Idaho DEQ has identified the area as one of concern due to the topography of the area.

10. Nez Perce County Transportation Plan: How will this project be coordinated/interact with the ongoing Nez Perce County Transportation Plan? What is the status of the Nez Perce County Transportation Plan, what model is being used, and are other members of the LCVMPPO involved?

The Nez Perce County Transportation Plan dealt with the area outside of the metropolitan area but included basic data about the connectivity between the metro area and the county. Any relevant information in this plan could be a source of information for the long range transportation plan based upon the evaluation of the consultant. The County expects adoption of the plan in early summer. If necessary, it can be amended to conform to the findings of the long range plan. No model was used; may adopt a model later if one is developed for the metro area that would be useful to the County.

11. Washington Plans: What is the status (past or current) of transportation plans in Asotin County, and for the Cities of Asotin and Clarkston? Who prepared these studies?

Asotin County has a six year transportation plan prepared by the County.

The city of Asotin has a six year transportation plan prepared by the Clerk and reviewed by the City Council for approval. This is done every August. This covers the arterial streets; the other streets are covered under Washington's Small Cities Preservation Program. The city does an inventory of the streets, rates them and submits for funding. \$50K is allowed.

12. Multi-Modes: From a budget perspective, what percentage of the work do you feel will be associated with alternative modes (rail, barge, freight, bike/ped, etc.) compared to roadway transportation?

The plan needs to be multi-modal. We would expect the consultant to provide advice on this level of work based upon their experience and the results of the citizens' participation plan, consistent with the level of funding available in our budget.

13. Barging: The issue of barging and dredging is a large complex issue. Do you have an anticipated level of work associated with this topic and working with the Ports?

We don't expect the consultant to resolve the many issues related to barging. We do expect an evaluation of the level of service now and the implications on traffic if barging is lost as an option.

14. Memo of Understanding: The UPWP notes the execution of the Memoranda of Understanding. Can this be posted on the web site or made available?

We will see if we can post it. It is merely the standard recitations of federal and state requirements for MPOs.

15. City of Clarkston: What is the status of the City of Clarkston as related to the LCVMPPO? How does the City of Clarkston fit into this work?

The City of Clarkston is not a member of the MPO. They voted not to adopt the by-laws. They are within the urban area. Functionally classified streets (i.e. collector and arterial) will be included in the regional plan and any projects in Clarkston will be considered for inclusion in the plan. They are welcome to join the MPO upon an affirmative vote of their Council.

16. Transit: In addition to Valley Transit, are there other transit providers in the valley? Is this an existing transit plan?

Valley Transit is the only transit provider in the valley. They are a private non-profit receiving FTA 5307 funds through the City of Lewiston under agreement. Other services (such as COAST) come to the valley but are not local providers.

17. Web Site: Is the LCVMPPO assembling a web site?

We are going to. No schedule has been set yet, though.

18. Needs: As noted in the UPWP, can additional insight and information be provided on “addressing the impacts of a major highway on downtown development”, and “. . . Snake River Avenue . . . potential impacts. . of rail service . . .”?

US 12 goes through downtown Lewiston and downtown Clarkston. Issues are related to congestion, traffic circulation, conflict between through traffic and local traffic. A spur of the Camas Prairie RailNet line crosses US 12 at the west end of downtown Lewiston, causing some tie-ups when it is in use (sporadic). This rail line then travels south along the west right of way of Snake River Avenue, thus limiting opportunity for widening this major street.

19. Budget: What is the programmed budget set aside for consultant fees for this project?

Refer to the budget contained in the UPWP.

20. Consultants: Which consultants have made contact expressing interest? Can this be distributed? Who did the RFP go to?

Consultant list will be posted on the website.

21. How many intersections are estimated for needing data collection?

Unknown. We will see if ITD can provide a link to our functional class map.

22. What is the preferred traffic model? Data Collection & Model: Task 2.0 of the UPWP describes services associated with updating data and recalibrating the existing travel-demand models. What software model is currently be used? Who is exercising the model and are you satisfied with it?

Currently the City of Lewiston has QRS2 which has not been updated since 1998. Other communities do not have a model. Washington State is changing their model. Consultant will review various models and needs of the community and make recommendation on a model that will be consistent with the needs of the metro area and with the requirements of WSDOT and ITD.

23. Is air traffic included in the report?

No, but surface transportation to and from the airport will be included.

24. Please provide clarification of the term "Regional" in the "Regional Long Range Transportation Plan". Does "Regional" mean the plan will look at the region around the LC Valley or are you seeking a plan concentrating on the Urban Growth Area (UGA) but includes the UGA's connection to the surrounding region?

This area does not qualify as an UGA (50,000 or more population within the state of Washington); therefore the region is primarily the metro planning area and its external relations with surrounding areas.